

## **REMARKS**

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 17, 2009. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 17, 19-21 and 23-25, 27, 31-36 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 7, 17 and 21 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are amended herein. Claims 26, 28, 29 and 30 are canceled herein without prejudice. New dependent claims 33-36 are added herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

No new matter is believed to have been introduced to the application by this amendment. Changes to the claims are fully supported by the original disclosure, including, for example, original paragraphs [07], [08], [16], [32], [70], and [71].

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,295,556 (Falcon) in view of U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. No. 2004/0003371 (Coulthard) and U.S. Patent No 7,076,504 (Handel); Claims 3, 9, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard, Handel, and U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. No. 2002/0091850 (Perholtz); Claims 4, 10, 25, 27, 28 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard, Handel, and U.S. Patent No. 7,039,709 (Beadle); Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard, Handel and U.S. Patent No. 7,181,524 (Lele); Claims 6, 12, 20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard, Handel, and U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. No. 2004/0183831 (Ritchy); Claims 11 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard, Handel, Beadle and Lele; and Claims 26, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard,

Handel, Beadle, and U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. No. 2002/0055917 (Muraca). These rejections are respectfully traversed, and reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The applied references are not understood to disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 1, particularly with respect to at least the following features: displaying at least a first connection icon directly on the desktop, wherein selecting the first connection icon allows a first connection represented by the first connection icon to become modifiable to alter the first connection, and wherein the remote computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop.

Turning to the applied references, Falcon discloses a method and system for configuring computers to connect to networks using network connection objects. See Falcon, Abstract. To facilitate the use of the connection objects, a connection manager 78 interfaces with the user through a folder 96 and manages the connection objects. Network connections generally appear as icons in the connection folder 96. See Falcon, FIGS. 5 and 6; col. 6:29-33. These icons are not and cannot be displayed directly on the desktop. Falcon's icons are in a connection folder 96 in FIG. 6, not directly on the desktop. In fact, folder 96 of FIG. 6 also displays an "X" on the top right corner because folder 96 appears as a window, and not as a desktop.

In column 6, lines 29-34, Falcon states: "To facilitate the use of the connection objects, as shown in FIG. 5, a connection manager 78 interfaces with the user through a folder 96 and manages the connection objects 76<sub>1</sub> – 76<sub>n</sub>." Accordingly, Falcon places the connection objects inside a folder (not on the desktop) in order to manage the connection objects. This is because the connection objects cannot be managed from the desktop, as explained further below.

As described in paragraph 0004 of the instant application, “[t]he original desktop shell for the Microsoft® Windows® family of operating systems, known as Microsoft® Explorer, does not allow a user to add, edit or delete connections between a remote computing device and a local computing device from the desktop shell. For instance, users of application such as Citrix®, which operates on the Microsoft® CE operating system must use a specialized connection manager interface to administer each connection, and existing connections cannot be displayed on the desktop.” (Emphasis added).

The Office Action states that dragging and dropping an icon from a displayed window to a desktop is a common and obvious technique, and that Handel shows placing a connection icon on a desktop. Assuming *arguendo* this is correct, if one would modify Falcon’s system and place its connection objects on the desktop, the resulting modified system would not work for its intended purpose (i.e., one cannot manage the connection objects from the desktop.).

“If proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification.” In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). MPEP 2143.01 V.

None of the cited references discloses or suggests a user interface as claimed that allows a connection represented by a connection icon displayed on the desktop to become modifiable, wherein the computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop. Mere placement (e.g., by dragging and dropping) of the connection icons from the folder to the desktop as suggested by the Office Action fails to achieve the user interface as claimed by the Applicant.

As such, a person of an ordinary skill in the art who desires a modifiable connection would not have been motivated to place the connection icons on the desktop. In addition, even if the connection objects of Falcon were placed on the desktop following the teaching of Handel, the resulting user interface would not allow the connections represented by the connection icons to be become modifiable as required by the claims. Coulthard does not remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Falcon or Handel.

Accordingly, the applied references, either alone or in combination, are not understood to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claim 1, which is believed to be in condition for allowance. Similar arguments apply to other independent claims 7, 17, and 21.

The other claims currently under consideration in the application are dependent from the independent claims discussed above and therefore are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

New dependent claim 33 recites that when the remote computing device connects to the first local computing device, the desktop is operative to automatically display, directly on the desktop of the remote computing device, a plurality of applications stored and executable on the first local computing device. The applied references, either alone or in combination, are not understood to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of claim 33. Similar arguments apply to dependent claims 34-36.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the

arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be other reasons for patentability of any or all claims that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Applicant's undersigned attorney may be contacted at the address and telephone number set forth below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502203 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

/Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub/  
Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub, Reg. # 39,266

18191 Von Karman Ave., Suite 500  
Irvine, CA 92612-7108  
Phone: 949.851.0633 SKL:lm  
Facsimile: 949.851.9348  
**Date: June 17, 2009**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 31824  
as our correspondence address.**